JAMES DAL BON C- BAR #157942 LAW OFFICES OF JAMES DAL BON 28 NORTH 1ST STREET SUFFICING SAN JOSE, CA 95113

FILED

JUL 2 5 2008

(408)297-4729

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF



RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FERNANDO RAMIREZ

Plaintiff,

VS.

DOSA PLACE INC. dba DOSAIPLACE,

UMAKANTH UPPALAPATI dba DOSAI

PLACE and DOSA PLACE INC.

Defendants

CO8 03613

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL:

- 1) Violation of California Labor Code Section 510;
- 2) Violations of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act;
- 3) Violation of California Business and Professions Code Section 17200;
- 4) Violation of California Labor Code Section 201;
- 5) Violation of California Labor Code Section 226.

NATURE OF CLAIM

19

20

21

22

24

25

- 1. This is an action on behalf of Fernando Ramirez who has been employed on a salary basis Dosa Place Inc. dba Dosaiplace, Umakanth Uppalapati dba Dosai Place And Dosa Place Inc. during the last four years prior to the filing of this Complaint, seeking damages arising from employer's failure to pay overtime as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act and the California Wage Orders and statutes.
- 2. Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages for unpaid wages under California Labor Code and Wage Orders, liquidated damages under 29 U.S.C. §216(b), waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, damages for inadequate pay statements under California Labor Code Section 226, and attorney's fees, costs, pre judgment interest pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and restitution under California Unfair Trade Practices Act under California Business and Professions Code § 17203.

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court is a proper venue, since all events giving rise to this lawsuit have occurred in this district.
- 4. Subject matter jurisdiction of this action of this Court is based upon Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§201 et. seq. and the pendant jurisdiction of this Court.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 5. At all times relevant herein Plaintiff Fernando Ramirez was a resident of Santa Clara County, California.
- 6. At all times relevant herein, Defendants Dosa Place Inc. dba Dosaiplace, Umakanth Uppalapati dba Dosai Place And Dosa Place Inc. employed Plaintiff Fernando Ramirez as a kitchen worker in their restaurant in Santa Clara County.

9

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

- 7. At all times relevant herein Dosa Place Inc. dba Dosaiplace, Umakanth Uppalapati dba Dosai Place And Dosa Place Inc. conducted business in Santa Clara County, California.
- 8. Individual Defendant Umakanth Uppalapati was, according to information and belief, the officer, owner, or employee of Defendants Dosa Place Inc. dba Dosai Place. having control over the Plaintiff's work condition and work situation.
- 9. Defendants Dosa Place Inc. dba Dosaiplace, Umakanth Uppalapati dba Dosai Place And Dosa Place Inc. shall be hereinafter collectively known as "Defendants".
- 10. Plaintiff Fernando Ramirez shall hereinafter be known as "Plaintiff".
- 11. Plaintiff was according to information and belief, an employee of Defendants acting in the normal course and scope of employment duties with Defendants as a kitchen worker.
- 12. During the course of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff regularly worked more than 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week, hours for which Plaintiffs were not properly compensated.
- 13. Defendants paid Plaintiff for his labor by cash.
- 14. Defendants did not issue a paystub with deductions to Plaintiff.
- 15. Plaintiff did not perform "exempt" duties in his position as a laborer with Defendants and thus was not subject to any exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 CFR 541.112, 541.209 and 541.209. The Plaintiff was not even marginally responsible for management or administrative functions, and their primary job duties did not require the exercise of independent discretion and judgment or regularly require invention or imagination in a recognized field of artistic endeavor more than fifty percent of her working time.

16. At no time during the Plaintiff's employment did Plaintiffs maintain any professional

exclusively manage any division of Defendants business where he customarily and

regularly exercised discretionary powers or perform services of management. Plaintiff

did not directly supervise any employees nor did he participate in the development of

license with the state or practice any recognized profession, nor did Plaintiffs

Filed 07/25/2008

6

4

8

12

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

proof.

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

general administrative policies of Defendants. COUNT ONE: VIOLATION OF CA LABOR CODE SECTION §510 FAILURE TO PROPERLY PAY OVERTIME WAGES 17. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates paragraphs 1-18 as if fully stated herein. 18. At all times relevant herein, California Labor Code Section 501, which applies to Plaintiff's employment by defendants, provided that all employees are entitled to payment at the rate of time and one half for hours in excess of 8 in one day, or 40 hours in one week, and double time for hours in excess of 12 in one day. 19. Labor Code Section 1194 provides that it is unlawful for employers not to make the

not paid such payments can recover any monies owed by civil action. 20. Defendants therefore owe Plaintiff lost wages and penalties in an amount subject to

required overtime payments identified in the preceding paragraph and that employees

- 21. Defendants have failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to pay Plaintiff the amount owed.
- 22. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff the required sum violates the provisions of Labor Code Sections 510 and 1194 and is therefore unlawful.
- 23. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194(a), Plaintiff requests that the court award Plaintiffs reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred by him/her in this action.

COUNT TWO: VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

FAILURE TO PROPERLY PAY OVERTIME WAGES

- 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates paragraphs 1-23 as if fully stated herein.
- 25. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff's employment was subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. and Plaintiff's were an individual employee covered by virtue of Plaintiff's direct engagement in interstate commerce.
- 26. The FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207 requires all employees to be paid overtime for work performed in excess of forty hours per week, unless specifically exempted by the law.
- 27. Although Plaintiffs were not so exempt during employment with Defendants, Defendants knowingly caused and permitted Plaintiffs to regularly work in excess of forty hours per week without paying Plaintiffs one and one half of Plaintiff's regular rate of pay.
- 28. By not paying overtime wages in compliance with the FLSA, defendants violated Plaintiff's rights under the FLSA.
- 29. Defendants therefore owe Plaintiffs lost wages and penalties in an amount subject to proof.
- 30. Therefore, as a direct and proximate result of defendants' failure to pay proper wages under the FLSA, Plaintiffs incurred general damages in the form of lost overtime wages.
- 31. Defendants intentionally, with reckless disregard for their responsibilities under the FLSA, and without good cause, failed to pay Plaintiff's proper wages, and thus defendants are liable to Plaintiffs for liquidated damages in an amount equal to lost overtime wages, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) of the FLSA.

11

10

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

32. Plaintiff was required to retain legal assistance in order to bring this action and, as such, is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) of the FLSA.

COUNT THREE: VIOLAITON OF CA LABOR CODE SECTION 201

FAILURE TO PAY WAGES DUE AND "WAITING TIME" PENALTIES

- 33. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1-31 as if fully stated herein.
- 34. At the time Plaintiff's employment with Defendant was terminated, Defendants' owed Plaintiff certain unpaid overtime wages.
- 35. Failure to pay wages owed at the time if an employee's termination as required by Labor Code §201 subjects the employer the payment of a penalty equaling up to 30 days wages, as provided for in Labor Code § 203.
- 36. As of this date, Defendants have failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to pay the amount due, thus making defendants liable to Plaintiff for penalties equal to thirty (30) days wages.
- 37. Defendants therefore owe Plaintiff lost wages and penalties in an amount subject to proof.
- 38. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.5, Plaintiff requests that the court award Plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in this action.
- 39. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 218.6, Plaintiff requests that the court award interest on all due and unpaid wages, at the legal rate specified by Civil Code Section 3289(b), accruing from the date the wages were due and payable.

COUNT FOUR: VIOLATION OF CA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES

23

- 40. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the allegations of paragraphs 1-41 as if fully stated herein.
- 41. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff's employment with Defendants was subject to the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders promulgated by the California Industrial Welfare Commission, which required all employees to be paid overtime for work performed in excess of forty hours per week or eight hours per day, unless specifically exempted by the law.
- 42. At all times relevant herein, as the employer of Plaintiffs, defendants were subject to the California Unfair Trade Practices Act (California Business and Professions Code § §17000 et seq.), but failed to pay the Plaintiffs overtime pay as required by applicable California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.
- 43. During the period Plaintiff was employed with the Defendant, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs legally required overtime pay to which he was legally entitled, with defendants keeping to themselves the amount which should have been paid to Plaintiff.
- 44. In doing so, defendants violated California Unfair Trade Practices Act, Business and Professions Code §17200, et seq. by committing acts prohibited by applicable California Labor Code provisions, California Wage Orders, and the FLSA, thus giving them a competitive advantage over other employers and businesses with whom defendants were in competition and who were in compliance with the law.
- 45. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' violations and failure to pay the required overtime pay, the Plaintiff's rights under the law were violated and the Plaintiff incurred general damages in an amount subject to proof.
- 46. Defendants had been aware of the existence and requirements of the Unfair Trade Practices Act and the requirements of state and federal wage and hours laws, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to pay Plaintiff overtime pay due.

47. Plaintiff, having been illegally deprived of the overtime pay to which he were legally entitled, herein seeks restitution of such wages pursuant to the Business and Professions Code §17203 in an amount subject to proof.

COUNT FIVE: VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 226 INADEQUATE PAY STATEMENTS

- 48. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of paragraphs 1-47 as if fully stated herein.
- 49. California Labor Code Section 226 provides that all employers shall provide to employees accurate and complete wage statements including, but not to limited to, an accurate and current statement of all rates paid for all regular and overtime hours worked during the pay-period, a complete and itemized statement of deductions, net wages earned, the dates for which payment is being made, any and all applicable piece rates, and the current address ad name of the employer.
- 50. California Labor Code Section 226 further provides that any employee suffering injury due to a willful violation of the aforementioned obligations may collect the greater of either actual damages or \$50 for the first inadequate pay statement and \$100 for each inadequate statement thereafter.
- 51. During the course of Plaintiffs' employment, defendants consistently failed to provide Plaintiffs with adequate pay statements as required by California Labor Code §226.
- 52. Defendants failed to provide such adequate statements willingly and with full knowledge of their obligations under Section 226.
- 53. Defendants' failure to provide such adequate statements has caused injury to the Plaintiffs.
- 54. Plaintiffs have incurred costs and fees in bringing this action and seek to recover such costs under California Labor Code §226.

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

- 55. For compensatory damages in an amount subject to proof
- 56. For liquidated damages per the FLSA equal to unpaid overtime wages in an amount subject to proof
- 57. For restitution of unpaid overtime pay pursuant to California Business and Professions

 Code §17203 in an amount subject to proof
- 58. For pre-judgment interest of 10% on the unpaid overtime compensation and unpaid salaries pursuant to California Labor Code §1194(a) in an amount subject to proof;
- 59. For waiting time penalty damages of thirty days wages to Plaintiffs pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 in an amount subject to proof
- 60. For actual damages in an amount subject to proof for inadequate pay statements pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226;
- 61. For reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to California Labor Code §1194(a) and 29 U.S.C. §216(b) of the FLSA;
- 62. For costs of suit herein; and
- 63. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

July 25, 2008

s/jdb LAW OPPICES OF JAMES DAL

BON

Case 5:08-cv-03613-PVT Document 1 Filed 07/25/2008

Page 10 of 10

JS 44 - No. CALIF - (Rev. 4/97)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO)

FERNANDO RAMIREZ

(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLANT (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

DEFENDANTS

DOSA PLACE INC. dba DOSAIPLACE, UMAKANTH UPPALAPATI dba DOSAI PLACE and DOSA PLACE INC.

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT

		MOLO)		(IN U.S. PLAINTI NOTE: IN LAND	COND	EMNATION	CASES, USE TI	HE LOCATION O	E TUE
Law Offices of James 28 North 1st Street Si	NAME ADDRESS AND TO s Dal Bon uite 210, San Jose, C		•	ATTORNEYS (IF KN	OWN)) INVOLVE	36	_	D\/ 7
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		(For diversity cases only) PT Citizen of This State □			CIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN "- "IN ONE BOX FOR AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) DEF Incorporated or Principal Place			
V. NATURE OF SUIT	2 Removed from State Court	ACE AN "• " IN IS Remanded from Appellate Court	ONE BO	X ONLY)	other	ed from district ecify)	☐6 Multidistrict Litigation	□7 Ар District Magistra	opeal to Judge from Ite Judgment
CONTRACT		TORTS		FORFEITURE/PENA	LTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER ST	TATI ITEC
120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Madicare Act 152 Recovery of Overlailled Student Loans (Excl Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 190 Stockholders Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	□ 310 Airplane □ 316 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault Libel & Stander □ 330 Federal Employers Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Manne Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury	PERSONAL INJUR 382 Personal Injury Med Malpractic 385 Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Li PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth In Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	e nal lability RTY	610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizun Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 RR & Truck 650 Airline Regs 660 Cocupational Safety/Health 530 Other ABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act	eizure of 0 881 ards Act tions orling &	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 882 Black Lung (923) 883 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 884 SSID Title XVI		□ 400 State Reapportronment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 460 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization □ Act □ 833 Environmental Matters	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETT		☐791 Other Labor Litigation ☐791 Empl.Ret. Inc. Security		FEDERAL TAX SUITS		■ 894 Energy Allocation Act ■ 895 Freedom of Information	
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	■ 442 Employment ■ 443 Housing ■ 444 Welfare ■ 440 Other Civil Rights	610 Motion to Vacate S Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 565 Prison Condition	ar	Act		870 Taxes (US Plaintiff or Defendant 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609		Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 960 Constitutionality of State Statures 890 Other Statutory Actions	
/I. CAUSE OF ACTION URISDICTIONAL STATUTES	(CITE THE US CIVIL S S UNLESS DIVERSITY)		HICH YO	U ARE FILING AND W	/RITE	BRIEF ST	ATEMENT OF	CAUSE. DO N	OT CITE
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 2		DEMA	ND \$ 45,000.00	_			manded in com	ıplaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE(S		REFER TO CIVIL L	.R. 3-12 C	ONCERNING REQUIR	EME	JURY DI	E (MOTIOE	YES NO	SE"
X. DIVISIONAL ASSIG	MMENT (CIVIL L.R.	3-2) (PLACE A "	- " IN ON	IE BOX ONLY) 🗀 :	SAN	FRANCIS	CO/OAKLAN	D MZISAN J	
7/25/00	2			M U					

11:10/08